



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,551	01/23/2004	Fumio Futami	1614.1380	3204
21171	7590	07/06/2007		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER KIM, DAVID S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/762,551

Applicant(s)

FUTAMI ET AL.

Examiner

David S. Kim

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 April 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Applicant's response to the objection to the drawings in the previous Office Action (mailed on 10 January 2007) is noted and appreciated. The drawings were received on 10 April 2007. These drawings are approved. Accordingly, the previous objection is presently withdrawn.

Claim Objections

2. Applicant's response to the objection to claim 8 in the previous Office Action (mailed 10 January 2007) is noted and appreciated. Applicant responded by changing the dependency of parent claim 6. As a result, claim 8 now has antecedent basis for "said planar lightwave circuit". Accordingly, the previous objection is presently withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 1-2 and 10-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sharma et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,355, hereinafter "Sharma").

Regarding claim 1, Sharma discloses:

A method of providing a multi-wavelength light source, comprising the steps of
modulating an optical pulse source so as to output optical pulses with a designated repetition frequency (e.g., 22 in Fig. 9);

time-division multiplexing the optical pulses output by said optical pulse source by branching (e.g., optical distributor 61) the optical pulses output by said optical pulse source to N paths and multiplexing (e.g., star coupler 62) the branched optical pulses so as to output optical pulses with a repetition frequency which is an integral multiple of said designated repetition frequency fo ("factor of N" in col. 10, l. 29-30), wherein a time difference among the respective paths is 1/(N*(fo)) (a time difference

Art Unit: 2613

between respective paths is $T/N = (1/f_o)/N = 1/(N*(f_o))$ because T is the pulse period, which is the inverse of the pulse frequency f_o); and

demultiplexing wavelengths of the optical pulses with the repetition frequency which is the integral multiple of said designated repetition frequency so as to output said wavelengths as the multi-wavelength light source (output in Fig. 9).

Regarding claim 2, Sharma discloses:

An apparatus for providing a multi-wavelength light source, comprising:

an optical pulse source which is modulated so as to output optical pulses with a designated repetition frequency f_o (22 in Fig. 9);

a time-division multiplexing unit which branches (e.g., optical distributor 61) the optical pulses output by said optical pulse source to N paths and multiplexes (e.g., star coupler 62) the branched optical pulses so as to output optical pulses with a repetition frequency which is an integral multiple of said designated repetition frequency f_o ("factor of N" in col. 10, l. 29-30), wherein a time difference among the respective paths is $1/(N*(f_o))$ (a time difference between respective paths is $T/N = (1/f_o)/N = 1/(N*(f_o))$ because T is the pulse period, which is the inverse of the pulse frequency f_o);

and a wavelength demultiplexing unit which demultiplexes wavelengths of the optical pulses with the repetition frequency which is the integral multiple of said designated repetition frequency so as to output said wavelengths as the multi-wavelength light source (output in Fig. 9).

Regarding claims 10-11, claims 10 and 11 are claims that introduce limitations that correspond to the limitations introduced by claims 1 and 2, respectively. Therefore, the recited limitations in claims 1-2 read on the corresponding limitations in claims 10-11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2613

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. **Claims 3-5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma.

Regarding claims 3-4, Sharma does not expressly disclose:

(claim 3) The apparatus for providing a multi-wavelength light source as claimed in claim 2, wherein said time-division multiplexing unit is a Mach-Zehnder-interferometer-type time-division multiplexing apparatus.

(claim 4) The apparatus for providing a multi-wavelength light source as claimed in claim 2, wherein said time-division multiplexing unit is a Michelson-interferometer-type time-division multiplexing apparatus.

However, these branching time-division multiplexing units are known and common in the art. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ any of these or other known and common branching time-division multiplexing units in the apparatus of Sharma. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since one would recognize that any suitable branching time-division multiplexing unit would provide the basic desired function of providing higher pulse repetition frequency in the apparatus of Sharma (e.g., col. 9, l. 51-52, 64-65; col. 10, l. 4-5, 29-31, 37-40).

Regarding claim 5, Sharma discloses:

The apparatus for providing a multi-wavelength light source as claimed in claim 2, wherein said time-division multiplexing unit time-division multiplexes said optical pulses using a plurality of optical waveguides with different optical path lengths (paths from 61 in Fig. 9)

Art Unit: 2613

Sharma does not expressly disclose:

said optical waveguides are arranged in a planar lightwave circuit.

However, planar lightwave circuits (PLCs) are well known in the art. Sharma discloses an example (51 in Fig. 8). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to embody the plurality of optical waveguides of Sharma (paths from 61 in Fig. 9) in a planar lightwave circuit. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since PLCs provide more component stability than other embodiments of a plurality of optical waveguides, such as loose links of fibers.

8. **Claims 6-8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Morioka et al. ("Multiwavelength picosecond pulse source with low jitter and high optical frequency stability based on 200 nm supercontinuum filtering", hereinafter "Morioka").

Regarding claim 6, Sharma does not expressly disclose:

The apparatus for providing a multi-wavelength light source as claimed in claim 5, wherein said wavelength demultiplexing unit is a wavelength demultiplexer having a multi-peak structure with a center transmission frequency spacing which is the integral multiple of said designated repetition frequency.

However, Morioka discloses the use of an arrayed-waveguide grating (AWG) wavelength demultiplexing unit (Morioka, AWG in Fig. 1). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ such a wavelength demultiplexer in the apparatus of Sharma. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since Sharma cites the use of such a wavelength demultiplexer in the background of the art (AWG of Morioka via col. 1, l. 14-18 of Sharma). Additionally, AWGs have a multi-peak structure with a center transmission frequency spacing. Moreover, the exact value of the frequency spacing of the AWG is a flexible design parameter with a wide range that encompasses the integral multiple of said designated repetition frequency. One reasonable motivation for employing such a frequency spacing is that greater frequency spacing in wavelength demultiplexers, including the frequency spacing of an integral multiple of said designated repetition frequency, is generally associated with less demanding manufacturing and component tolerances, which leads to cheaper costs.

Art Unit: 2613

Regarding claim 7, Sharma in view of Morioka discloses:

The apparatus for providing a multi-wavelength light source as claimed in claim 6, wherein said wavelength demultiplexer is an arrayed waveguide grating filter (Morioka, AWG in Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 8, Sharma in view of Morioka does not expressly disclose:

The apparatus for providing a multi-wavelength light source as claimed in claim 7, wherein said planar lightwave circuit and said arrayed waveguide grating filter are provided on one board.

However, the integration of multiple components into one unit/housing/board is an extremely common practice in the art. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to do so with various components in the apparatus of Sharma in view of Morioka. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since it is well known that integration generally provides benefits such as more compact apparatuses, economies of scale, and faster operation speeds.

9. **Claim 9** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Watanabe et al. (European Patent Application, EP 1 185 007 A2, hereinafter "Watanabe").

Regarding claim 9, Sharma does not expressly disclose:

The apparatus for providing a multi-wavelength light source as claimed in claim 2, further comprising a spectrum-broadening unit which broadens spectrum of the optical pulses which are received at said time-division multiplexing unit, said spreading effected by a non-linear medium having a third-order non-linear effect.

However, such spectrum-broadening units are known in the art, as shown by Watanabe (e.g., nonlinear optical waveguides/fibers in Figs. 2-3, 9, and 15). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include such a spectrum-broadening unit(s) to broaden the spectrum of the optical pulses which are received by the time-division multiplexing unit of Sharma. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this for any variety of exemplary beneficial applications disclosed in Watanabe, such as suppression of a reduction in optical signal-to-noise ratio (Fig. 2 and paragraph [0040]) and noise removal (Figs. 3-4 and paragraphs [0044-0049]). Additionally, a broader spectrum in the apparatus of Sharma could lead to a wavelength demultiplexing

Art Unit: 2613

unit with less narrow frequency spacing requirements, which is generally associated with less demanding manufacturing and component tolerances, which leads to cheaper costs.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed on 10 April 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments (REMARKS, p. 5, section IV) are based on the new limitations introduced by Applicant's most recent amendment. However, the details of the standing rejections above further show how Sharma still teaches these new limitations. Accordingly, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David S. Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-3033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9 AM to 5 PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth N. Vanderpuye can be reached on 571-272-3078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2613

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DSK



**KENNETH VANDERPUYE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Approved by DSK
25 JUNE 2007



FIG.1

PRIOR ART




FIG.2

PRIOR ART

